



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/608,267	06/27/2003	Brian Jones	60001.0244US01/MS300530.1	8319
27488	7590	01/25/2008		
MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT)			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 2903			PAULA, CESAR B	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/25/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/608,267

Applicant(s)

JONES ET AL.

Examiner

CESAR B. PAULA

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 January 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2,3,5,7-9,11-13,15-19 and 21-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2,3,5,7-9,11-13,15-19 and 21-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/12, 12/03, 12/19/7.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to the RCE amendment, and IDSs filed on 10/23, 10/12, 12/03, 12/19, and 1/7/2008 respectively.

**This action is made Non-Final.**

2. In the amendment, claims 4, 10, and 14 have been canceled. Claims 2-3, 5, 7-9, 11-13, 15-19, and 21-24 are pending in the case. Claims 3, 11, and 21 are independent claims.

#### ***Drawings***

3. The drawings filed on 6/27/2003 have been accepted by the Examiner.

#### ***Specification***

4. The objection to the abstract of the disclosure has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

#### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

5. The information disclosure statements filed on 10/12, 12/03, 12/19, and 1/7/2008 respectively have been considered, except for some US applications, which have not been entered due to their confidentiality or not filed in the English language.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 2-3, 5, 7-9, 11-13, 15-19, and 21-24 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huynh et al, hereinafter Huynh, (USPub # 2002/0198909, 12/26/2002).

Regarding independent claim 3, Hyunh discloses an application program module for creating a document, and communicating with action DLLs connected to the program, which determine what actions, associated with a markup language document text strings, to present to a user in relation to the markup language of the data strings. A recognizer DLL sends semantic categories including labels to the program module. An object is compared to properties, contained in a native format, such as HTML or XML, such as date of creation, media type, device model, a subject associated with the object, etc. The object is then labeled with the appropriate label as obtained from the properties (0036, 0039-0042, 0044, 104-106, 0078-0080, 0176-0177)-- *comparing the elements of the markup language data with a plurality of stored markup language elements associated with stored labels to determine a match; and if a one or more markup language elements matches one or more stored markup language elements associated with stored labels, then labeling the text string with the associated stored label of the matched one or more markup language elements.*

Additionally, Huynh discloses sending the labeled object to action plugins associated with the label or type of object (0039, 0080-0102, 0104-0107). --receiving a text string annotated with markup language data in an action dynamic link library (DLL); transmitting the text string, the markup language data and the one or more labels associated with the at least one annotated and the at least one unannotated portions to a plurality of action plug-ins, wherein the action plug ins are determined based on the one or more labels; determining, in the action plug-ins, one or more actions based on the associated markup language data, and the one or more labels; passing the one or more actions to an application program module for displaying the one or more actions in association with the text string; displaying the one or more actions in association with the text string; wherein for any portion of the text string not annotated with markup language data the method further comprises: receiving the text string in a recognizer dynamically linked library (DLL); receiving markup language data associated with the text string in the recognizer dynamically linked library; parsing the associated markup language data to assist the recognizer DLL to determine one or more labels for the text string; and transmitting the one or more labels and the associated markup language data to the application program module for passing to the action DLL. Huynh fails to explicitly teach parsing markup language data associated with the at least one annotated portion to assist the recognizer DLL to determine one or more labels for the at least one unannotated portion of the text string. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to determine the label for the unannotated text using the annotated text, because of all the reasons found in Huynh, including using other parts of the document text to determine the

semantic label of an element, such as an address (185). This would have provided the benefit of quickly, and effectively ascertaining the identity of a text string associated with previously identified related string.

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 3, Hyunh discloses action DLLs connected to the program, which determine what actions, associated with a markup language document text strings, to present to a user in relation to the markup language of the data strings. A recognizer DLL sends semantic categories including labels to the program module (0036, 0039-0042, 0044, 104-106).

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 3, Hyunh discloses comparing the strings and the markup for matching labels. If a match is found labeling the string with the associated label (0039-0042, 0044, 0078-0080, 104-107).

Regarding claim 7, which depends on claim 3, Hyunh discloses adding labels to the document (0042-0044).

Regarding claim 8, which depends on claim 7, Hyunh discloses adding labels to the document, once the label has been obtained (0042-0044).

Regarding claim 9, which depends on claim 3, Hyunh discloses adding labels to the document, using metadata (0042-0044).

Regarding independent claim 11, Hyunh discloses an application program module for creating a document, and communicating with action DLLs connected to the program, which determine what actions, associated with a markup language document text strings, to present to a user in relation to the markup language of the data strings. A recognizer DLL sends semantic categories including labels to the program module. Metadata is used for those cases where information found in a string is not sufficient. The labeled objects are sent to action plugins associated with the label or type of object. The object is then displayed to a user along with the appropriate action to be performed (0036, 0039-0042, 0044, 0064, 0070-0071, 0080-0102, 104-107) -- *as a string of text having an associated one or more Extensible Markup Language (XML) elements is entered into the electronic document, determining whether the string of text matches one of a plurality of stored strings; if so, then designating a label associated with the matched stored string for application to the entered string of text; if the string of text does not match one of a plurality of stored strings, determining whether the one or more XML elements associated with the string of text is associated with a label for use with the entered string of text; and if so, then designating a label associated with the one or more XML elements for application to the entered string of text, wherein the label is to be transmitted to one or more action plug ins for determining a set actions associated with the string of text, and wherein the action plug-ins to receive the label are also determined based on*

*the label; displaying an indication indicating that the label has been found for the string of text.*

Huynh fails to explicitly teach *utilizing at least one label associated with another string in the electronic document.* It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to determine the label for the unannotated text using the annotated text, because of all the reasons found in Huynh, including using other parts of the document text to determine the semantic label of an element, such as an address (185). This would have provided the benefit of quickly, and effectively ascertaining the identity of a text string associated with a previously identified related string.

Regarding claim 12, which depends on claim 11, Huynh discloses adding actions associated with labels of the document text string or markup (0042-0044, 0104-016).

Regarding claim 13, which depends on claim 12, Huynh discloses adding labels to the document using semantic categories containing a namespace in a document (0039, 0042-0044, 0104-0107).

Regarding claim 15, which depends on claim 13, Huynh discloses adding actions associated with labels of the document text string or markup (0042-0044, 0104-016).

Regarding claim 16, which depends on claim 15, Huynh discloses adding actions associated with labels of the document text string or markup. A user is allowed to select and perform the actions (0042-0044, 0104-016).



Claim 17 is directed to a computer readable medium equivalent to the steps of claim 11, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 18, which depends on claim 16, Hyunh discloses an action DLL determining and passing action to be performed to appropriate action plugins (0040-0044).

Regarding claim 19, which depends on claim 11, Hyunh discloses using a URL if there is no action plugin associated with the label (0042-0044).

Regarding independent claim 21, Hyunh discloses an application program module for creating a document. An action DLL connected to the program determines what actions, associated with a markup language document, to present to a user. A recognizer DLL sends semantic categories including labels to the program module (0036, 0039-0040, 0044, 104-106).

Additionally, Hyunh teaches a received object is compared to properties, contained in a native format, such as HTML or XML, such as date of creation, media type, device model, a subject associated with the object, etc. The object is then labeled with the appropriate label as obtained from the properties, and transmitted to action plug ins to determine actions to be associated with the objects (0036, 0039-0042, 0044, 104-106, 0078-0080, 0176-0177).

Regarding claim 22, which depends on claim 21, Hyunh discloses an application program module for creating a document, and communicating with action DLLs connected to the program, which determine what actions, associated with a markup language document text

strings entered by a user, to present to a user in relation to the markup language of the data strings. A recognizer DLL sends semantic categories including labels to the program module (0036, 0039-0042, 0044, 104-107).

Claim 23 is directed to a system for performing the steps of claim 4, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 24, which depends on claim 17, Huynh discloses an application program module for creating a document, and communicating with action DLLs connected to the program, which determine what actions, associated with a markup language document text strings, to present to a user in relation to the markup language of the data strings. A recognizer DLL sends semantic categories including labels to the program module. Metadata is used for those cases where information found in a string is not sufficient (0036, 0039-0042, 0044, 0064, 0070-0071, 104-106). Huynh fails to explicitly teach *the label associated with the string of text is an "address" label and the label associated with the other string of text is a "ZIP code" label*. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to determine the label for the unannotated text using the annotated text, because of all the reasons found in Huynh, including using other parts of the document text to determine the semantic label of an element, such as an address (185). This would have provided the benefit of quickly, and effectively ascertaining the identity of a text string associated with part of a previously identified related string.

***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are not persuasive. The Applicants states that the Huynh reference is disqualified as proper prior art under 35 USC 103 (c), because both the reference and the instant invention belonged to the same assignee (Microsoft Corp.) (pages 9-10) . Upon further review, 35 USC 103(c) does not apply under the circumstances above, since Huynh was published 12/26/2002, and therefore the date is prior art under 35 USC 102 (a).

Claims 2, 5, 7-9, 12-13, 15-19, and 24 stand rejected at least based on the rationale above.

***Conclusion***

I. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, go to <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>. Should you have any questions about

Application/Control Number:  
10/608,267  
Art Unit: 2178


Page 11

access to the Private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866  
217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service  
Representative or access to the automated information system, please call 800-786-9199 or 571  
272-1000 (USA or Canada).

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- (571)-273-8300 (for all Formal communications intended for entry)

  
CESAR PAULA  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
1/22/2008